

**To:** Richard Mylott/R8/USEPA/US@EPA[]  
**From:** "MARK DRAJEM (BLOOMBERG/ NEWSROOM:)" <mdrajem@bloomberg.net>  
**Sent:** Mon 8/20/2012 7:54:37 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Re:Pavillion Qs  
[main\\_body.html](#)

Rich - Here is what Encana said in this expert report: ``As explained below in further detail, this review concludes that EPA's monitoring wells MW01 and MW02 were not properly designed, drilled and completed. As a result, cement has come in contact with the water-bearing sands being tested and both wells are contaminated. Neither of these wells, in their current condition, is a reliable water quality monitoring well. Rehabilitating these wells to serve as groundwater monitoring wells to detect constituents to part per billion levels would be difficult, at best." -- There's more but that is the summation of Encana's complaints. Thanks, Mark

----- Original Message -----

From: Mylott.Richard@epamail.epa.gov  
To: MARK DRAJEM (BLOOMBERG/ NEWSROOM:)  
At: Jul 13 2012 11:26:32

Hi Mark-- thanks for your email. Little new based on the last update. The public comment period for EPA's draft report remains open and we are currently focused on our commitment to secure additional data from deep monitoring wells in Pavillion. In April, EPA coordinated with USGS, the tribes, and the State of Wyoming to resample the wells. The purpose of the sampling is to gather more information about groundwater and develop additional data for consideration by an independent peer-review panel that will review EPA's draft report. EPA also separately resampled nearby domestic wells in April. Samples have been sent to laboratories for analysis and will be subject to a quality assurance review before being compiled into summary reports. We expect data reports from EPA and USGS will be available and posted online by this fall.

If you need anything else on background, I'd be happy to help. I'll be back in the office Monday am. Thanks!

Richard Mylott  
Public Affairs Specialist  
Office of Communications and Public Involvement  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8  
Phone: 303-312-6654

-----"MARK DRAJEM (BLOOMBERG/ NEWSROOM:)" <mdrajem@bloomberg.net> wrote:

-----  
To: Richard Mylott/R8/USEPA/US@EPA  
From: "MARK DRAJEM (BLOOMBERG/ NEWSROOM:)" <mdrajem@bloomberg.net>  
Date: 07/12/2012 12:13PM  
Subject: Re:Pavillion Qs

Richard - I visited Pavillion last week and talked with lots of folks there. I am doing a big story on what is going on there and what it means. Are there any amendments or changes to what you sent me back in April? Would it be possible to schedule an interview with Greg Oberley, who folks credit with kicking off this investigation. Thanks, Mark 202 624 1964

----- Original Message -----

From: MARK DRAJEM (BLOOMBERG/ NEWSROOM:)  
To: Mylott.Richard@epamail.epa.gov

At: 4/27 14:41:07

OK, thanks for sending this out. I appreciate it, Mark

----- Original Message -----

From: Mylott.Richard@epamail.epa.gov

To: MARK DRAJEM (BLOOMBERG/ NEWSROOM:)

At: 4/27 13:56:27

Mark-- sorry this took a while. It's been a hectic week...  
I can send some questions, but I really hope I can get on the phone  
with  
one of your experts to talk this through. So, here goes:

We are in the midst of an ongoing public comment and pending  
independent  
review process focused on the draft report. As such we are referring  
reporters to the draft report itself and the information available at  
<http://www.epa.gov/region8/superfund/wy/pavillion/>

1. In the draft report, you conclude, ``the data indicates likely  
impact  
to ground water that can be explained by hydraulic fracturing." In the  
congressional hearing, though, Mr. Martin seemed to walk back from  
that.  
Is that still your understanding of those earlier results? Was that  
result  
based on tests in just the two test wells, or also from wells at homes  
or  
farms?

EPA stands behind the draft report, which is based on an assessment of  
data from Pavillion area wells and outlines preliminary findings based  
on  
that data. The draft report focuses on data collected from two deep  
monitoring wells installed by EPA in 2010, and references additional  
information collected from shallow monitoring and domestic wells in the  
area. The report, along with additional data now being collected from  
the  
monitoring wells in coordination with USGS, the tribes and the State of  
Wyoming, will be subject to a public comment and independent review  
process.

2. Are your new tests the EPA and state are doing now just of those two  
test wells, or also of the wells at homes/farms?

EPA is coordinating with USGS, the tribes, and the State of Wyoming on  
resampling the deep monitoring wells. The purpose of this sampling is  
to  
gather more information about the site and provide additional data from  
the monitoring wells for consideration by the peer review panel for  
EPA's  
Draft Report on the Pavillion groundwater investigation. EPA is also  
separately resampling nearby domestic wells. We expect data will be  
available later this summer or early fall.

3. The draft report refers to finding ``diesel range organics" in some  
water. What could explain that? There wasn't oil drilling nearby,  
right?

Was this diesel used in the frac job?

Sampling results and a discussion of DRO and GRO can be found on page 35 and 36 of the draft report. The use of diesel in the Pavillion field is also discussed.

4. One lawmaker said that the EPA may have contaminated the wells in taking out the water. Have you discovered any evidence of that?

No. EPA conducted confirmation sampling and analysis to ensure that contamination of the monitoring wells did not occur during the drilling process or well development.

5. For the folks living in the town on Pavillion, I was told that their water was cleared, and no new contamination is expected because Pavillion is upstream of the drilling. Is that so?

EPA's primary concern is groundwater contamination in the area east of Pavillion's municipal wells. Water from Pavillion's public water supply is treated and monitored regularly under the Safe Drinking Water Act.

6. What is your standing recommendation for the houses located closer to the wells? Should they still get water shipped in and vent their showers?

Health-based recommendations for domestic use and showering (for those homes with high methane) were issued by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, part of the federal Department of Health and Human Services, in the fall of 2010. Those recommendations are still in effect.

7. I am not sure if you guys have this information, but do you know how many instances of fracturing there were in that area? Someone had told me there was only one well fracked there, but the report seems to indicate many instances of it.

The best sources for specific information on the number of hydraulic fracturing jobs that have been conducted in the area would be the State of Wyoming or EnCana. There have been many occurrences of the practice in the Pavillion field.

Richard Mylott  
Public Affairs Specialist  
Office of Communications and Public Involvement  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8  
Phone: 303-312-6654

[attachment "main\_body.html" removed by Richard Mylott/R8/USEPA/US]